

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/808,810	WIZIG, LEWIS HOWARD	

Examiner	Art Unit	
RACHEL L. PORTER	3626	

All Participants:

(1) RACHEL L. PORTER.

Status of Application: Pending response to Amdt filed 9/26/08

(3) Walter Hanchuk, Reg 35,179.

(2) Nathan Paulsen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 January 2009

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

103, 101

Claims discussed:

Claims 53, 70; 77,94; 101, 118

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Spoke to Mr. Paulsen, indicating that Examiner would delay action, to issue Examiner's amendment to overcome 101 issues if applicants wanted to incorporate claims indicated as allowable (70, 94, and 118) into independent claim. Mr. Hanchuk returned call to follow-up and could not contact applicants. No agreement could be reached.